Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0851-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)		
		PHNL010087		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	Application Number		Filed	
	10/082,857		10/19/2001	
on	First Named Inventor			
Signature	HUIZER			
	Art Unit		Examiner	
Typed or printed name	2134		Aubrey Wyszynski	
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.				
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.				
I am the applicant/inventor		/Larry Liberchuk/		
		Signature		
assignee of record of the entire interest.		Larry Liberchuk		
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Typed or printed name			
attorney or agent of record. 40,352 Registration number		914-333-9602		
	····	Tek	ephone number	
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.		03/26/2007		
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34	Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.				
\$ }				

This collection of information is required by 36 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of : HUIZER, Cornelis Marinus

Serial No. : 10/082,857 Filed : 10/19/2001

Atty. Docket : PHNL010087

Group Art Unit : 2134

Examiner : Aubrey H. Wyszynski

Conf. No. : 4953

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it is alleged that the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter since the specification indicates that some of the features are typically implemented in software ... and as such, lack a structural relationship ... This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 7 fall within one of the enumerated categories of 35 U.S.C. §101. The examiner is requested to review the following materials for clarification: In re Warmerdam, 33 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1994), In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994), In re Beauregard, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995), and the USPTO Guidelines on the statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicant's claims are directed to a "rendering device" and as such are statutory.

1

Serial No. 10/082,857

Applicant's claims do not require an underlying memory medium as the elements of the claims

may be directed to software, but do not require it. It is respectfully submitted that it is improper

to read descriptions of illustrative embodiments into the claims as limitations. The language of

the specification including "are typically" is in fact permissive language in that it describes a

situation wherein the elements may be implemented in software. Contrary to the examiner's

assertions, the elements do not require an "underlying medium". A person of ordinary skill in

the art would readily appreciate that a receiving module 111, for example, may be implemented

in software, hardware, or combinations thereof, and accordingly, the elements of the claims

should be understood as such. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are in proper form

and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No.

14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Larry Liberchuk/

Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352

Senior IP Counsel

Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation

914-333-9602

March 27, 2007

2